UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/776,282	02/12/2004	Carlos V. Perry JR.	06080003C1	3518	
	7590 05/11/200 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.O		EXAMINER		
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE			PRINCE, FRED G		
RESTON, VA 20191		,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1724		
				. *	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/11/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

Application No. Applicant(s) **Advisory Action** 10/776.282 PERRY, CARLOS V.

	10/110,202	FERRIT, CARLOS	٧.
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred Prince	1724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr nally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action: or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	will <u>not</u> be entered b TE below);	ecause
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		moliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)):	p.i.a.it. / willond.ii.o.j.t	(1.102.021).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate,		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	It before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attact	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered buseline. 		n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	-	
•		Fred Prince	
		Primary Examiner	-1./

Art Unit: 1724 5/7/07 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with regard to claims 24-26 and 30 are not persuasive for the reasons previously given. In reciting "septic system tank" applicant has not added structure to the claim. For example, as applicant is aware, a septic tank may consist substantially of nothing more than a tank with an inlet and outlet (see, for example, US Pat No 1,150,510 to Ellis et al.). Since an inlet and outlet were already recited prior to adding "septic system" applicant clearly has not added structure to the apparatus. In reciting "effluent" applicant has not added structure to the tank itself as "effluent" does not structurally alter the apparatus previously recited. Further, it is respectfully noted that "effluent" is not limited to "wastewater" as effluent may be anything flowing from a source. Accordingly, applicant is arguing limitations not claimed in asserting that the instant invention in some way recites "wastewater". This limitation is clearly not recited in the claims. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 27-29 are persuasive. Accordingly, an amendment in which all the limitations of claim 27 are added to claim 24 and claim 30 is cancelled would place the application in condition for allowance.